DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 027 986 95 RC 003 137

By-Cruickshank, Donald R.; And Others

Perceived Problems of Teachers in Schools Serving Rural Disadvantaged Populations and their Comparison with Problems Reported by Inner-City Teachers.

Tennessee Univ., Knoxville. Coll. of Education.

Spons Agency-Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.

Pub Date [68]

Note-35p.

EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.85

Descriptors-*Comparative Analysis, Culturally Disadvantaged, *Economically Disadvantaged, *Educational Problems, Inservice Programs, Problems, Rural Population, Rural Schools, *Rural Urban Differences, Rural Youth, *Teacher Attitudes, Teacher Education, Teacher Role, Urban Population, Urban Schools, Urban Youth

Identifiers-*Teacher Problem Inventory, TPI

As a result of a previous study made to determine what it was like to teach in inner-city schools of America, a complementary study was conducted which focused on the problems of teaching the rural disadvantaged. Together they provided a data base which identified prominent educational problems characteristic of impoverished urban and rural settings. As opposed to random sampling, an extreme group sampling procedure was adopted to specify problems peculiar to the least affluent rural teaching context. These rural, disadvantaged schools were identified first by county and then by the most disadvantaged elementary schools within these counties. The principal instrument used was the Teacher Problem Inventory (TPI) used for the first study and expanded by rural school teachers to include a few specific problems. The expanded TPI was administered to 354 teachers. The responses were then classified on the basis of frequency or severity scales. Only those significant items weighted in the direction of the often or serious categories were reported. Comparisons of the data from both studies were made which show great similarities and notable differences, which are further depicted with tables. (CM)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED027980

PERCEIVED PROBLEMS OF TEACHERS IN SCHOOLS SERVING RURAL DISADVANTAGED POPULATIONS AND THEIR COMPARISON WITH PROBLEMS REPORTED BY INNER-CITY TEACHERS

Donald R. Cruickshank
John J. Kennedy
James Leonard
Robert Thurman
University of Tennessee

(The study reported herein was supported under the National Defense Education Act, Title XI)

Purpose of the Study

In 1967 a study was made to determine what it was like to teach in inner-city schools of America.[1] The present study which focused on the problems of teaching the rural disadvantaged, was intended to complement the first. Together they provide a data base which identifies prominent educational problems characteristic of impoverished urban and rural settings. The data should be useful to those making decisions about pre-service and in-service preparation programs for teachers who work or will work with either urban or rural disadvantaged children.

Rationale for the Study

Only recently has national attention been directed toward the growing problems of rural America. The Special Report of the

---

[1]Donald R. Cruickshank, and James Leonard. The Identification and Analysis of Perceived Problems of Teachers in Inner-City Schools. The NDEA National Institute for Advanced Study in Teaching Disadvantaged Youth. Occasional Paper/ One. Washington, D. C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1967.

RA003137

President's National Advisory Commission on Rural Poverty made headlines in the fall of 1967 when it stated that,

> This report is about a problem which many in the United States do not realize exists. The problem is rural poverty....which is so widespread, and so acute, as to be a national disgrace, and its consequences have swept violently into our cities.[2]

Highlights of the report indicated that:

--Poverty is even more extensive in small towns and rural areas than in cities. (In cities one in eight is poor. In rural America one in four is poor.)

--A larger majority of its victims are white. (Eleven million white--three million non-white.)

--Urban riots have their roots in rural poverty because a high proportion of people crowded into city slums are refugees from even worse rural slums. ("Many merely exchange life in a rural slum for life in an urban slum.")

The report contains recommendations to all levels of government and to private individuals and groups which, if enacted, are intended to reduce or eliminate the blight on rural Americans. Among the many recommendations are thirty-three directed toward improving education. Although no recommendation focuses solely on teacher preparation, at least two (Recommendations 2 and 3) concern themselves with poor teacher salaries, professional inbreeding, and the lack of special or advanced teacher training.

---

[2]President's National Advisory Commission on Rural Poverty. The People Left Behind. (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1967). p. IX.

Even though teacher educators in colleges and universities seem to be aware of the need to prepare teachers who can make a difference in disadvantaged settings, they seem unable or unwilling to make "appropriate" modifications in the professional programs.[3] Several reasons may be advanced to account for the itertia. First, there is little information available about what it takes to be an effective teacher of the disadvantaged. Second, and related to the first reason, there is a serious division of opinion about whether or not it takes any special training at all to be a teacher of the disadvantaged. Many prominent educators would claim that they are preparing "good teachers"--"good anywhere." Third, changing the teacher education curriculum or even a part of it is an exercise only for the bold or foolish. It is time consuming, exhausting, and a genuine threat to even one's best-intentioned colleagues. Perhaps most important of all, little study has been done which provides hard data upon which such decisions can be based.

This rural study, as its urban companion piece, represented an attempt to put together data that can provide a clearer picture of the kinds of difficulties teachers face as they serve disadvantaged (rural) children. The results can be useful to teacher educators, curriculum specialists, and school administrators among others. These data can be interpreted to build models and theories which would be useful vehicles for change. On an operational level the findings to be reported can serve as the bases for inservice education and materials development.

---

[3] John Edgerton, "Survey: A lack of Preparation in the Colleges," Southern Education Report, April 1967, pp. 2-13.

Methodology

Selection of Sample

The sampling strategy was to identify nationally, distinctively rural schools populated by predominantly disadvantaged youngsters. Since the intent of the survey was not to provide a description of typical rural school problem situations (which would imply the use of randomization in the sampling design), but rather to specify problems peculiar to the least affluent rural teaching context, an extreme group sampling procedure was adopted.

The county or equivalent political subdivision served as the first stage sampling unit. This unit seemed appropriate since the great majority of schools serving rural youth in the nation are organized on a county basis. A complete listing of U. S. counties ranked on the basis of "rural well-being" was obtained from the Economic Development Division, Economic Research Service of the U. S. Department of Agriculture. The listing consisted of 3,081 counties ordered on the basis of a five factor index of rural well being.[4] To achieve a semblance of national representation, counties were stratified according to the nine standard geographical Divisions employed by the U. S. Census Bureau and other government agencies.[5]

---

[4]The rural well being index consisted of the unweighted combination of the following five numerical values: (1) the number of rural families with less than $3,000 family income in 1959, (2) the percent of rural families with less than $3,000 family income in 1959, (3) the percent of rural persons 25 years old and over with less than seven years of schooling completed in 1960, (4) the percent of occupied rural housing units in deteriorated and dilapidated condition in 1960, and (5) a ratio of rural persons under 20 years and over 65 years old to rural persons 20 through 64 years old in 1960.

[5]The nine geographic divisions consisted of state groupings constructed principally on the basis of geographical proximity. The divisions are: (1) New England, (2) Middle Atlantic, (3) East North Central, (4) West North Central, (5) South Atlantic, (6) East South Central, (7) West South Central, (8) Mountain, and (9) Pacific.

Employing the U. S. Department of Agriculture's index of rural well being, the five most rurally disadvantaged counties within each division were identified. The first stage sample, therefore, consisted of forty counties.[6]

The identification of the most disadvantaged elementary school within each of the 40 selected counties comprised the second stage of the sampling procedures. Because of the paucity of readily accessible information relating to individual schools, a decision was made to rely on the judgement of each respective county superintendent to select a school within his district which served large numbers of rural disadvantaged children. Specifically 40 superintendents were contacted by mail, informed of the intent of the survey, and requested to secure the cooperation of a school in his district that best met the rural disadvantaged criteria. Cooperation was solicited from 26 of the 40 superintendents.

Data Collection

The principal instrument used to assess the nature and extent of problems confronted by rural teachers consisted of a listing of 194 critical incidents. This instrument represented an extension of the 184 item critical-incident Teacher Problem Inventory (TPI) developed for a previous study on problems of teachers in inner-city schools.[7] Essentially, procedures identical to those used originally to construct the TPI were used in its expansion. Specifically, several months prior to the actual data collection, half of the

---

[6]Had the stratification scheme not been utilized, identification of the 40 most rurally disadvantaged counties would have been restricted to only counties in the South.

[7]Cruickshank and Leonard, op. cit.

teachers representing all grade levels in the 26 participating schools were requested to provide critical problem situations. Each day for a period of 10 days, teachers reported the school incident which caused them the greatest concern using a prepared instrument entitled "My Biggest Problem Today Inventory" (MBPTI). Two graduate assistants made a joint analysis of returned MBPTIs for the purpose of identifying problems not previously included in the original 184 TPI. Ten such items were identified and subsequently added to the original instrument.

The expanded TPI requested respondents to consider each of the 194 problem statements in terms of both (a) its frequency of occurrence (often; occasionally; never) and (b) its severity (serious; minor; no problem). Field visits were made to the 26 participating schools by faculty members and doctoral students for the purpose of administering the expanded TPI to the total faculty. A total of 354 teachers, grades K-6 completed the TPI.

Field investigators were instructed to provide a description of the school and community environment. A 20 item questionnaire consisting of items relating to the economic base and social composition of both the school and community was administered orally to school principals. An evaluation of the supplemental data provided by these instruments resulted in the elimination of three schools from the sample. Briefly, the three schools in question, although distinctively rural, did not appear to serve economically disadvantaged youth.

To determine which of the 194 items (problem situations) were perceived by participating teachers (N=354) as (a) occurring most

frequently and (b) being most severe, two chi-square analyses were performed on each item respectively. The overall response on each scale (frequency and severity) was employed as the expected frequency for each separate analysis. Thus, a significant result (P. .01) would indicate that teachers' response to a particular item deviated from the overall trend of items comprising the scale.

Results

Of the 194 items, 78 were significant on either the frequency or severity scales (See Table I, Columns 1 and 2). Of the 78 significant items, 53 were significant on both the frequency and severity scales (See Table I, Column 3). Only those significant items weighted in the direction of the often or serious categories of the instrument are reported.

In order to sharpen the problem focus those statistically significant items reported by more than one-third of the respondents as occurring most frequently (often) were determined. (See Table II, Column 1.) Similarly, significant items reported by more than one-third of the respondents as being most severe (serious) were determined (See Table II, Column 3). Rank orders for each category of problems (frequent-severe) are given in columns 2 and 4 respectively.

Combining significant items reported by more than one-third of the respondents as either frequent or severe or both (combining Columns 1 and 3 of Table II) provides a nucleus of 16 significantly frequent and serious problems reported by teachers working with rural disadvantaged children. (See Table III.) Nine items or

problems were reported by more than one-third of the respondents as both frequent and severe (See Table II, Column 5).

Discussion

Following immediately upon the heels of a similar study which employed an almost identical methodology, it is incumbent upon the researchers to provide comparison. However, viewing the latter study by itself several comments are in order. First, methodologically it is possible to gain the cooperation of teachers and schools in economically disadvantaged rural areas and to collect descriptive data from them about their perceptions of teaching the disadvantaged. The hundreds of critical incidents supplied which formed the basis for revising the TPI in most cases are a rich source of data. By themselves they are a case book. Provision of such raw data attests to the fact that teachers serving the rural disadvantaged are willing to document their plights quite openly. This phenomenon is somewhat contrary to the view that rural schools and rural communities are suspicious of outsiders.

Secondly this study as its predecessor suffers from incomplete treatment of the data. Factor analytic techniques need to be applied to both studies to determine overriding problem areas which were merely "eyeballed" by the researchers. It is likely that further data treatment will reveal a handful of related concerns which could be dealt with more adequately in pre and in-service education.

Seventy-eight significant problems resulting from the Chi-Square item by item analysis of the 194 TPI problem statements are listed in Table I. Thus forty percent of the items, when

Table I about here

empirically observed and expected frequencies are contrasted, show a marked or significant difference. This set of problems is the basic one from which other comparisons are drawn.

In an attempt to discriminate further, a second criterion was applied to the problems reported in Table I. Table II lists only those significant problems reported on either or both scales (frequency and severity) by at least one-third of the respondents.

Table II about here

Reporting the problems in this manner (arithmetically weighted) permits them to be ranked. Thus the sixteen problems are ordered by both "frequency" and "severity." No combined ranking is provided.

Rural teachers reveal most concern (items ranked 1-3) with the area of language arts ("children have reading difficulties, lack appropriate reading materials at home, can't express themselves well orally"). The sixth ranked problem, "limited vocabulary and speech patterns," also is a communication concern. Rural teachers, then, perceive their students are most poorly equipped in this functional area.

A second order of problems seems to be personal characteristics of such students. They "don't listen to, remember, or follow instructions" (ranked 5 and 6 on the scales), "have limited or unsatisfactory outside experiences," (ranked 8 and 9), "are not

motivated" (ranked 9 and 7), "are immature, have low ability" (ranked 10 and 8), and "are often hungry and sleepy" (unranked in frequency, ranked 13 on severity).

Another gross category of teacher concern seems to be related to family circumstances. Teachers note that, "parents are not interested in children's classwork" (unranked in frequency, ranked 10 in severity), that "homes lack materials children need for doing homework" (unranked in frequency, ranked 14 in severity) and that "children suffer from overcrowded, cramped home conditions" (unranked in frequency, ranked 15 in severity).

Finally, teachers ranked three school or classroom related problems among the highest sixteen. They are "finding time for individual instruction" (ranked 4 and 3.5), "performing outside class duties" (ranked 7 in frequency but unranked in severity), and "children unprepared for grade level work due to poor teaching methods in early grades" (unranked in frequency, ranked 11 in severity).

In summary, seventy-eight of 194 TPI problems were found to be significant either by frequency of occurrence, severity, or on both dimensions. Of the seventy-eight statistically significant problems, sixteen of them were reported by at least one-third of the respondents on one or both scales.

Resultant questions which merit discussion and could lead to further study include: (1) How well do teachers' perceptions of problems correlate with perceptions of school administrators, parents, or children? (2) Are the teachers' problems merely a reflection of a value bias or culture conflict? (3) Do problems vary according to

geographic region, racial or national origin of children or teachers, grade level, years of teaching experience or other? (4) What relationships exist between reports of teacher "stayers" and "leavers"? (5) How can the school and/or community alleviate any specific problem or problem area? (6) How many problems or problem areas are artifacts of a teaching-learning environment not likely to change without major changes in the system? (7) How can colleges replicate these problems and get them into teacher education curricula for further analysis and solution?

Comparison of the results of the study of teaching in rural disadvantaged areas with the previous study of teaching in urban disadvantaged areas is in order. The earlier study[8] noted that 287 inner-city elementary teachers reported ninety-six statistically significant problems on the TPI form which contained ten fewer items than the form used in the current study. Rural teachers, then, perceived a narrower spectrum of problems than their colleagues in the inner-city. When the total number of statistically significant problems further is reduced by applying the "one-third responding" criterion, urban teachers continued to report a broader range of problems--forty-five as contrasted to sixteen.[9] Table III permits comparison of the ranking of the sixteen most prominent rural teacher problems with their ranking accorded by inner-city teachers.

Table III about here

---

[8] Cruickshank and Leonard, op. cit. p. 3 and Table II p. 7-10.

[9] Ibid. pp. 5-6.

Gross comparison of the data in Table III reveals that the most frequent-severe problems of rural teachers are quite like those reported by inner-city teachers. Correlations appear to be positive and high. Certain items are exceptions. For example item 4 "Performing outside class duties (hall monitor, lunchroom supervisor)" ranks seventh in frequency for rural teachers and is not indicated among the ninety-six significant problems of inner-city teachers. Conversely item 94 ("parents not interested in their children's classwork"), item 128 (" children unprepared for grade level work due to poor teaching methods in early grades"), item 13 ("child who comes from a disruptive or broken home"), item 150 ("children coming to school without proper food or sleep") and item 92 ("lack of materials in the home available to children for doing homework or schoolwork") are heavier problems for inner-city teachers. That is, they are ranked considerably higher in either or both frequency or severity.

Significant problems common to both studies are in Table IV while Table V identifies twelve problems significant for rural teachers but not urban teachers. (Number 4 mentioned above is among

---

Table IV and V about here

---

them.) On the other hand Table VI lists forty-five significant problems reported by inner-city teacher but not by rural teachers.

Table VI about here

The three tables indicate that these two teacher populations have more problems in common than not and that each group has some problems not felt by the other one.

Again gross comparisons are interesting and interpretations necessary. Taking "rural only" problems first, teachers perceive that they are frequently burdened by "outside of classroom duties." Apparently the rural teacher serves many more non-teaching roles than his city counterpart.

Rural teachers note "they do not have enough time to use the school library when needed." This problem statement might reflect something else, that is, that libraries in such schools are inadequate or simply do not exist. Unfortunately no assessment of library facilities was made during the field visit.

Rural teachers alone are concerned that "parents ask to keep children home for inadequate reasons." However both groups report "trouble eliminating child absences or tardiness" (Item 1). Interpretation is tenuous since it may be that rural parents ask permission first while urban parents simply keep children out of school or the "tardiness" factor in item one may suggest tardiness is the key issue. The latter explanation can be supported since children take school buses and probably are absent if they are tardy. A surprise is item 114 reported only by rural teachers, "controlling children who physically assault the teacher." Further conjecture probably is in order for each problem reported. However, this is left to the reader.

Likewise, careful attention should also be directed to the problems of inner-city teachers only. By themselves they present

a formidable array of obstacles to be eliminated by teachers, administrators, and communities. Again many of the problem statements reveal that children and/or parents exhibit behavior antithetical to that expected by and acceptable to authority figures in schools. It is apparent that increased dialogue between schools and the communities they serve is in order and that some leavening of school and teacher values may be implicit. That professional educators may have failed to determine educational goals and practices acceptable to both schools and the disadvantaged communities they serve is made manifest in recent disturbances in school communities in America's cities.[10] The same phenomenon might occur in rural America except for low population density and transportation problems.

Summary and Conclusions

Two studies sponsored by the NDEA National Institute for Advanced Study of Teaching Disadvantaged Youth have been made. The first, published in 1967, reports the perceived problems of elementary school classroom teachers who work in inner-city schools in twelve of America's largest cities.[11] The study reported herein was conducted using comparable procedures with a sample of teachers working in schools serving the most disadvantaged rural children including white, black and Indian populations.

Both studies reveal problems perceived by teachers which are frequent, severe, or both. Comparisons of the data from both studies show great similarities but also notable differences.

---

[10]For a discussion of the crises in urban America and a presentation of alternatives see Mario D. Fantini Alternatives for Urban School Reform. New York: Ford Foundation, 1968.

[11]Cruickshank and Leonard, op. cit.

It is incumbent upon teacher educators and their research colleagues to study this data bank carefully in order to begin to understand and to explain the phenomena occurring as teachers work with disadvantaged children. Lack of sensitivity to the real world of teaching the disadvantaged and failure to theorize about it have been supportable charges filed against colleges and universities preparing school personnel. Hopefully this data will serve another function--that of providing a basis for the development of new methods and materials which can be instituted in preparation programs. The overhaul of teacher education programs is well underway. Evidence of the nature presented here should be given careful consideration before new curricula solidify.

TABLE I

Chi-Square Values for Seventy-Eight Significant Problems from the Teacher Problem Inventory

ITEM ON TPI	PROBLEM STATEMENT	Column 1 Frequency X^2(P. .01)	Column 2 Severity X^2(P. .01)	Column 3 Both
1.	Having trouble eliminating repeated child absences or tardiness.	52.90	56.99	X
4.	Performing outside class duties (e.g., hall monitor, lunch supervision, etc.).	246.40	9.29	X
6.	Handling excessively large classes.	40.82	71.55	X
7.	Having enough time to use the school library when needed.	41.91	17.07	X
12.	Children associating with other children who are a poor influence.	22.96	22.67	X
13.	Helping a child who comes from a disruptive or broken home.	151.57	170.02	X
15.	Dealing with the child who is upset by some home incident before coming to school.	67.03	21.92	X
16.	Knowing what to do about children who have been mistreated at home.		12.15	
17.	Helping a child with social adjustment problems.	98.74	77.16	X
22.	Parents requesting children to be excused from school for inadequate reasons. (To pay bills, to baby-sit, to go on a trip.)	12.54		
26.	Helping children who do not have adequate clothing.	15.35		

TABLE I (Cont.)

Problem	Freq. X^2	Severity X^2	Both
28. Getting parents to cooperate on such matters as children's appearance, cleanliness, attendance, discipline, etc.	63.66	66.99	X
29. Too much emphasis on grades by parents and students.	62.92	35.44	X
30. Explaining to parents that their children have serious school-related problems.		38.45	
34. Students misbehaving when left unsupervised for short periods of time.	107.81	95.31	X
36. Helping children not willing to eat new foods.		19.34	
44. Dealing with students who feel that stealing is acceptable.		10.38	
46. Finding satisfactory methods of disciplining children.	32.43	17.68	X
47. Eliminating cheating, lying or stealing.	104.84	109.70	X
49. Maintaining order while class is moving in halls.		203.20	
51. Helping the child who daydreams most of the time.	89.73	100.26	X
52. Involving most students in class discussions (e.g., not permitting one student to dominate the discussion).	47.40		
53. Getting children to do their own work.	136.90	106.31	X
54. Children refusing or otherwise finding ways to get out of doing class work.	86.65	71.84	X

TABLE I (Cont.)

Problem	Freq. X^2	Severity X^2	Both
58. Dealing with children who want attention and will do anything to get it.	97.30	93.46	X
62. Helping children work independently.	129.22	99.83	X
63. Students eating or chewing gum in class.	37.02		
67. Helping emotionally retarded children.	33.87	80.61	X
70. Dealing with classroom interruptions and disruptions of the normal schedule.	59.57	23.64	X
71. Helping children keep track of their school supplies and personal possessions.	69.96	22.49	X
72. Helping children settle down to work when they arrive in the morning or after transfer from another classroom.	10.96		
75. Dealing with student who rejects all help offered and all friends.		13.00	
76. Dealing with children who are extremely nervous or hypersensitive.		65.64	
79. Getting children to keep clean and to take an interest in their personal appearance.		73.59	
82. Dealing with children who do not care if they receive poor grades.	186.95	336.61	X
83. Dealing with children who are destructive to other student's property.	37.84	31.76	X

TABLE I (Cont.)

Problem	Freq. X^2	Severity X^2	Both
88. Handling children who won't obey teacher directions or orders.	18.49	14.02	X
89. Helping children who have language difficulty (non-English speaking or other).		27.95	
90. Having difficulty explaining material to children so that they understand.	31.04	30.77	X
92. Lack of materials in the home available to children for doing their homework or school work (e.g., pencil, paper).	150.11	113.72	X
93. Lack of appropriate reading materials in the home.	603.48	95.82	X
94. Dealing with parents not interested in their children's classwork.	150.92	241.79	X
95. Having difficulty contacting parents and/or scheduling conferences.	51.51	49.76	X
100. Helping children who suffer from overcrowded, cramped home conditions (e.g., lack of space for study, poor sleeping arrangements).	66.55	113.72	X
101. Dealing with children who have limited or unsatisfactory experiences outside school.	225.42	246.77	X
102. Dealing with children who have limited vocabulary and speech patterns.	409.02	370.09	X
103. Helping children overcome fear of trying something new.	41.12	39.36	X
108. Getting students to do homework and classwork properly.	132.95	131.43	X
111. Working with children with reading difficulties.	805.85	711.14	X

TABLE I (Cont.)

Problem		Freq. X^2	Severity X^2	Both
112.	Inability of children to express in writing what they can express orally.	516.68	391.27	X
113.	Dealing with a constantly disruptive child.	22.45	88.08	X
114.	Controlling children who physically assault the teacher.	397.38	265.09	X
123.	Getting students to use good manners when eating.	132.95	74.04	X
124.	Children misbehaving when they go alone to the lavatory or to another class.	51.94	58.28	X
125.	Dealing with children who don't listen to, remember, and follow instructions (tests, homework, etc.).	117.48	232.91	X
128.	Helping children unprepared for grade level work due to poor teaching methods in early grades.	54.02	147.8	X
131.	Helping children to understand and practice acceptable classroom behavior.	54.47		
132.	Finding methods to reduce restlessness during inclement weather.	45.00		
134.	Differentiating instruction among slow, average, and gifted children.	101.44	71.90	X
137.	Finding time for individual instruction.	468.87	378.35	X
138.	Finding a variety of adequate instructional methods.	22.78	25.88	X

TABLE I (Cont.)

Problem	Freq. X^2	Severity X^2	Bot
142. Unable to complete classwork scheduled for the day.	37.68		
150. Children coming to school without proper food or sleep.	118.96	161.90	X
152. Being unable to help children who need dental or medical attention.		23.31	
154. Helping mentally retarded children.		75.21	
160. Helping children who are afraid of failure.		14.99	
162. Integrating the isolated child.		23.04	
163. Reaching the apathetic child.		25.29	
164. Helping a child realize his own capabilities and limitations.	113.33	96.10	X
165. Pupil being reluctant to talk with teacher concerning problems.	16.50	20.29	X
168. Difficulty understanding attitudes and values of the child.	66.69	42.28	X
169. Finding methods for teaching children who are immature, lacking in experience, or who have low ability.	217.93	282.00	X
170. Dealing with children not motivated to work.	247.23	274.67	X
172. Having children do independent or group work quietly.	49.24		
179. Finding appropriate instructional materials and situations that deal with the child's background.	34.80	39.45	

TABLE I (Cont.)

Problem	Freq. X^2	Severity X^2	Both
180. Dealing with parents who won't respond to teacher or school notes, messages or report cards.		25.89	
187. Insufficient time to complete grading of papers, lesson plans.	41.70	20.91	X
194. Finding satisfactory methods of grading students without using A, B, C, D, or F, in order to avoid competition among students.	33.39		

TABLE II

Sixteen Significant Problems Reported By More Than One-Third Of 354 Classroom Teachers As Occurring Most Frequently and Being Most Serious

ITEM ON TPI	PROBLEM STATEMENT	Percentage Reported by Frequency	Rank Order By Frequency	Percentage Reported by Severity	Rank Order By Severity	Occurring in Frequency and Severity
		1	2	3	4	5
111.	Working with children with reading difficulties.	59.9	1	65.0	1	X
93.	Lack of appropriate reading materials in the home.	53.1	2	56.8	2	X
112.	Inability of children to express in writing what they can express orally.	50.0	3	50.9	3.5	X
137.	Finding time for individual instruction.	48.0	4	50.9	3.5	X
125.	Dealing with children who don't listen to, remember, and follow instructions (tests, homework, etc.).	45.5	5	46.1	6	X
102.	Dealing with children who have limited vocabulary and speech patterns.	44.4	6	49.7	5	X
4.	Performing outside class duties (e.g., hall monitor, lunch supervision, etc.).	38.7	7			
101.	Dealing with children who have limited or unsatisfactory experiences outside school.	35.6	8	43.8	9	X
170.	Dealing with children not motivated to work.	34.5	9	47.8	7	X

TABLE II (Continued)

ITEM ON TPI	PROBLEM STATEMENT	Percentage Reported by Frequency	Rank Order By Frequency	Percentage Reported by Severity	Rank Order By Severity	Occurring in Frequency and Severity
		1	2	3	4	5
169.	Finding methods for teaching children who are immature, lacking in experience, or who have low ability.	33.9	10	45.2	8	X
94.	Dealing with parents not interested in their children's classwork.			43.5	10	
128.	Helping children unprepared for grade level work due to poor teaching methods in early grades.			37.6	11	
13.	Helping a child who comes from a disruptive or broken home.			37.0	12	
150.	Children coming to school without proper food or sleep.			35.9	13	
92.	Lack of materials in the home available to children for doing their homework or school work (e.g., pencil, paper).			34.8	14	
100.	Helping children who suffer from overcrowded, cramped home conditions (e.g., lack of space for study, poor sleeping arrangements).			34.8	15	

TABLE III (Continued)

ITEM ON TPI	PROBLEM STATEMENT	Percentage Reported by Frequency	Rank Order By Frequency	Percentage Reported by Severity	Rank Order By Severity
170.	Dealing with children not motivated to work.	34.5/36.6	9/15	47.8/52.3	7/14
169.	Finding methods for teaching children who are immature, lacking in experience, or who have low ability.	33.9/36.2	10/17	45.2/49.8	8/16
94.	Dealing with parents not interested in their children's classwork.	0/46.3	0/9	43.5/61.3	10/4
128.	Helping children unprepared for grade level work due to poor teaching methods in early grades.	0/0	0/0	43.5/41.8	10/26
13.	Helping a child who comes from a disruptive or broken home.	0/46.0	0/10	37.0/58.9	12/7
150.	Children coming to school without proper food or sleep.	0/38.7	0/13	35.9/57.8	13/8
92.	Lack of materials in the home available to children for doing their homework or schoolwork.	0/49.5	0/7	34.8/51.2	14/15
100.	Helping children who suffer from over-crowded, cramped home conditions.	0/0	0/0	34.8/47.4	15/19

TABLE IV

SIXTY-SIX SIGNIFICANT PROBLEMS COMMONLY REPORTED BY RURAL AND INNER-CITY TEACHERS

1. Having trouble eliminating repeated child absences or tardiness.
6. Handling excessively large classes.
12. Children associating with other children who are a poor influence.
13. Helping a child who comes from a disruptive or broken home.
15. Dealing with the child who is upset by some home incident before coming to school.
16. Knowing what to do about children who have been mistreated at home.
17. Helping a child with social adjustment problems.
26. Helping children who do not have adequate clothing.
28. Getting parents to cooperate on such matters as children's appearance, cleanliness, attendance, discipline, etc.
30. Explaining to parents that their children have serious school-related problems.
34. Students misbehaving when left unsupervised for short periods of time.
44. Dealing with students who feel that stealing is acceptable.
46. Finding satisfactory methods of disciplining children.
47. Eliminating cheating, lying or stealing.
49. Maintaining order while class is moving in halls.
51. Helping the child who daydreams most of the time.
52. Involving most students in class discussions (e.g., not permitting one student to dominate the discussion).
53. Getting children to do their own work.
54. Children refusing or otherwise finding ways to get out of doing class work.
58. Dealing with children who want attention and will do anything to get it.
62. Helping children work independently.
63. Students eating or chewing gum in class.

TABLE IV (Continued)

67. Helping emotionally retarded children.

70. Dealing with classroom interruptions and disruptions of the normal schedule.

71. Helping children keep track of their school supplies and personal possessions.

72. Helping children settle down to work when they arrive in the morning or after transfer from another classroom.

76. Dealing with children who are extremely nervous or hypersensitive.

79. Getting children to keep clean and to take an interest in their personal appearance.

82. Dealing with children who do not care if they receive poor grades.

83. Dealing with children who are destructive of other student's property.

88. Handling children who won't obey teacher directions or orders.

90. Having difficulty explaining material to children so that they understand.

92. Lack of materials in the home available to children for doing their homework or school work (e.g., pencil, paper).

93. Lack of appropriate reading materials in the home.

94. Dealing with parents not interested in their children's classwork.

95. Having difficulty contacting parents and/or scheduling conferences.

100. Helping children who suffer from overcrowded, cramped home conditions (e.g., lack of space for study, poor sleeping arrangements).

101. Dealing with children who have limited or unsatisfactory experiences outside school.

102. Dealing with children who have limited vocabulary and speech patterns.

103. Helping children overcome fear of trying something new.

108. Getting students to do homework and classwork properly.

111. Working with children with reading difficulties.

112. Inability of children to express in writing what they can express orally.

113. Dealing with a constantly disruptive child.

TABLE IV (Continued)

123. Getting students to use good manners when eating.

124. Children misbehaving when they go alone to the lavatory or to another class.

125. Dealing with children who don't listen to, remember, and follow instructions (tests, homework, etc.).

128. Helping children unprepared for grade level work due to poor teaching methods in early grades.

131. Helping children to understand and practice acceptable classroom behavior.

132. Finding methods to reduce restlessness during inclement weather.

134. Differentiating instruction among slow, average, and gifted children.

137. Finding time for individual instruction.

142. Unable to complete classwork scheduled for the day.

150. Children coming to school without proper food or sleep.

152. Being unable to help children who need dental or medical attention.

160. Helping children who are afraid of failure.

162. Integrating the isolated child.

163. Reaching the apathetic child.

164. Helping a child realize his own capabilities and limitations.

165. Pupil being reluctant to talk with teacher concerning problems.

168. Difficulty understanding attitudes and values of the child.

169. Finding methods for teaching children who are immature, lacking in experience, or who have low ability.

170. Dealing with children not motivated to work.

172. Having children do independent or group work quietly.

179. Finding appropriate instructional materials and situations that deal with the child's background.

180. Dealing with parents who won't respond to teacher or school notes, messages or report cards.

TABLE V

TWELVE SIGNIFICANT PROBLEMS REPORTED BY RURAL TEACHERS BUT NOT INNER-CITY TEACHERS

4.	Performing outside class duties (e.g., hall monitor, lunch supervision, etc.).
7.	Having enough time to use the school library when needed.
22.	Parents requesting children to be excused from school for inadequate reasons. (To pay bills, to baby-sit, to go on a trip.)
29.	Too much emphasis on grades by parents and students.
36.	Helping children not willing to eat new foods.
75.	Dealing with student who rejects all help offered and all friends.
89.	Helping children who have language difficulty (non-English speaking or other).
114.	Controlling children who physically assault the teacher.
138.	Finding a variety of adequate instructional methods.
154.	Helping mentally retarded children.
187.*	Insufficient time to complete grading of papers, lesson plans.
194.*	Finding satisfactory methods of grading students without using A, B, C, D, or F, in order to avoid competition among students.

*Items not on Inner-City TPI which were added to expanded form used in this study.

TABLE VI

FORTY-FIVE SIGNIFICANT PROBLEMS REPORTED BY INNER-CITY TEACHERS BUT NOT BY RURAL TEACHERS

5.	Audio-visual equipment either not available or not functioning properly.
8.	Children "withdrawing" after being corrected.
10.	Children arriving at school wet or staying at home because of inclement weather.
35.	Handling an only child who expects the same special privileges at school as he has at home.
37.	Handling discipline problems or disturbance caused by children not in my class.
39.	Teaching children to share school equipment.
43.	Helping children who are afraid to leave school because they fear bodily harm by others.
48.	Not knowing what to do when children use improper language, stories, or behavior.
57.	Dealing with children who feel that teachers are against them.
61.	Difficulty of student or substitute teacher maintaining class control when teacher is absent.
64.	Dealing with children who fake illness to escape punishment or to avoid school work.
65.	Helping children to line up properly.
66.	Children bringing outside arguments to school.
69.	Handling students who want to play disciplinarian for the rest of class.
74.	Dealing with attachment by child to a teacher as a result of rejection and/or lack of affection at home.
81.	Child becoming very upset when he does not perform up to peer group expectations, (e.g., playing games in gym).
84.	Students who do work slowly in order to avoid additional work assigned to those finishing early.
96.	Children trying to buy the friendship of their classmates.

TABLE VI (Continued)

97. Handling child illnesses such as vomitting in classroom.

98. Students throwing or shooting objects in class.

99. Preventing one student from causing another student physical harm.

105. Children copying misbehavior or inattentiveness of another child.

106. Finding destruction or mistreatment of room property.

107. Dealing with a child who rebels against the teacher.

109. Handling children who experience tantrums.

110. Dealing with children who deliberately try to upset the teacher by misbehaving.

115. Controlling outbursts of fighting, aggressiveness, or over-competitiveness.

117. Students not paying attention during assembly and creating discipline problems.

120. Child hitting another for no obvious reason.

121. Inability of children in differentiating between fact and fantasy.

122. Overcoming half-truths or misconceptions fostered by parental influence.

126. Helping the class to maintain composure under unusual circumstances (fire drills, visitors in class, accidents).

127. Helping the class to accept children who are different (e.g., clothing, lack of money, ethnic background).

139. Being patient or remaining impartial when working with certain children.

145. Being too tired to operate efficiently.

147. Being asked to perform tasks usually classified as "professional" duties (e.g., filling out survey reports).

151. Children reading library books or drawing during a teaching period.

155. Determining whether students who claim they are ill are telling the truth.

157. Children messing their clothing and work area when using art materials.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Selected Sources on Rural Education

Prepared

by

D. R. Cruickshank
College of Education
The University of Tennessee and

Roger Stiles
Pee Dee Regional Supplementary Education Center
Florence, South Carolina

Aikman, Arthur L. "The Rural Poor," Illinois Education, 55:349, April 1967.

Bathurst, Effie G., and Jane Franseth. Modern Ways in One- and Two-Teacher Schools. Washington: U. S. Office of Education Bulletin, 1951, No. 18. 1951. 48pp.

Beale, Calvin L. "Population Trends and Distribution in Rural Areas," Rural Education - A Forward Look. Washington: NEA, Department of Rural Education, Year-book, 1955. pp. 299-306.

Brunner, Edmund deS., and J. H. Kolb. Rural Social Trends. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1933. 386 pp.

Brunner, Edmund deS., et al. American Agricultural Villager. New York: Doran, 1927. 326 pp.

Burnham, Ernest. Two Types of Rural Schools. Columbia University Contribution to Education, No. 51. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1912. 129 pp.

Butterworth, Julian E., and Howard A. Dawson. The Modern Rural School. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1952. 494 pp.

Butterworth, Julian E., and others. Organization of Curriculum for One-Teacher Schools. Washington: NEA, Department of Rural Education, 1933. 44 pp.

Castor, Russell E. "Better Programs for Rural Areas," Minnesota Journal of Education, 47:15-16, February 1967.

Chase, Francis S. "The Task Ahead on Achieving Equal Opportunity for All," Rural Education - A Forward Look. Washington: NEA, Department of Rural Education, Yearbook, 1955. pp. 246-251.

Cushman, Martelle L. "The Reality of Rural Education," Phi Delta Kappan, 36:4-6, 1954.

Cyr, Frank W. "Needed Research on the Reorganization of School Districts in Rural Areas," Teachers College Record, 38:293-315, 1937.

Daniel, Walter G. "Problems of Disadvantaged Youth, Urban and Rural," Journal of Negro Education, 33:218-224, Summer 1964.

Dawson, Howard A. "Rural Education - A Backward and A Forward Look," Rural Education - A Forward Look. Washington: NEA, Department of Rural Education, Yearbook, 1955. pp. 216-227.

Dunn, Fannie W. (ed.). The Child in the Rural Environment. Washington: NEA, Department of Rural Education, Yearbook, 1951. 253 pp.

Dunn, Frannie W. "Experimentation in Organization and Teaching in One-Teacher Schools," Teachers College Record, 33:494-504, 1932.

Egerton, John. "One-Teacher Schools Are Still Around," The Education Digest, 32:12-14, January 1967.

Evers, Lorraine Elizabeth. "A Rural Supervisor's Work in Monroe County." Unpublished Master's Thesis, The University of Tennessee, 1950.

Facilities for Education in Rural Areas. UNESCO 21st International Conference on Public Education, No. 192. Geneva: International Bureau of Education, 1958. 241 pp.

Fox, Robert S. (ed.). Teachers in the Small Community. Washington: NEA, Department of Rural Education, Yearbook, 1956. 222pp.

Franseth, Jane. Supervision in Rural Schools. Washington: U. S. Office of Education, Bulletin No. 11. GPO, 1955. 44 pp.

Franseth, Jane. Supervision in Rural Schools: A Report on Beliefs and Practices. U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education. OE-36005. Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1965. 57 pp.

Gaummitz, Walter H. Availability of Public School Education in Rural Communities. Washington: U. S. Office of Education Bulletin, 1930, No. 34. GPO, 1930. 53 pp.

Green, Robert L., and Louis J. Hofmann. "A Case Study of the Effects of Educational Deprivation of Southern Rural Negro Children," Journal of Negro Education, 34:327-341, Summer 1965.

Grove, Ernest W., "Trends in Farm and Rural Incomes and Their Distribution," Rural Education - A Forward Look. Washington: NEA, Department of Rural Education Yearbook, 1955. pp. 335-340.

Handbook of Rural Education. Washington: NEA, Department of Rural Education, 1961.

Haney, George E. A School Transfer Record System for Farm Migrant Children. U. S. Department of Health Education, and Welfare, Office of Education. OE-23042. Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office. 23 pp.

Isenberg, Robert M. "The Rural Disadvantaged," NEA Journal, 52:27, April 1963.

Koch, William H., Jr. Dignity of Their Own: Helping the Disadvantaged Become First-Class Citizens. New York: Friendship Press, 1966. 190 pp.

Kolb, John H., and Edmund deS. Brunner. Study of Rural Society. Third Edition. Edited by William F. Ogburn. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Company, 1946.

Kreitline, Burton. Rural Education: Community Backgrounds. New York: Harper, 1954. 411 pp.

Living and Learning in Small Rural Schools. State Department of Education, Division of Elementary Schools. Nashville: Tennessee State Department of Education, 1943. 127 pp.

McAllister, Jane Ellen. "These Three: In a Mississippi Program for the Disadvantaged," Journal of Secondary Education, 42:3-11, January 1967.

Melvin, Bruce L. Sociology of a Village. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1931. 138 pp.

Moore, Arthur. Underemployment in American Agriculture. Planning Pamphlet No. 77. National Planning Association, 1952. 100 pp.

National Education Association, Department of Rural Education. A Policy for Rural Education in the United States. Washington: The Association, 1940.

National Education Association, Department of Rural Education. Rural Education - A Forward Look. Washington: Yearbook, 1955. 486 pp.

National Education Association, Research Division. "Rural Teachers in 1951-52." NEA Research Bulletin, 31:1-63, February 1953.

National Society for Study of Education. The Community School. 52nd Yearbook, Part II. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1953. 292 pp.

Powell, Lacy D., and Charles E. Johnson. "Clayton County Seeks Some Answers," NEA Journal, Washington: 56:36-37, April 1967.

President's National Advisory Commission on Rural Poverty. The People Left Behind, Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1967. 160 pp.

Raper, Arthur F. "Rural Social Differentials," In Carl C. Taylor and others, Rural Life in the United States. New York: Knopf, 1949. pp. 309-326.

Sahrag, Peter. "Appalachia: Again the Forgotten Land," Saturday Review, 51:14-18, January 27, 1968.

Schatzmann, Iman Elsie. The Country School at Home and Abroad. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1942. 233 pp.

Scholes, William E. Next Move for the Migrants. New York: Friendship Press, 1966.

Smith, R. M. Education in Rural and City School Systems. U. S. Office of Education Circular No. 329. GPO, 1951. 13 pp.

Stromberg, Eugene T. The Influence of the Central Rural School on Community Organization. Agricultural Experimental Station. Ithaca: Cornell University, 1938. 39 pp.

Wiggins, Dessie M. "Curriculum Problems of Small Rural High Schools in Texas," School Review, 40:460-466, 1932.

Works, George A., and Simon A. Lesser. Rural America Today. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1942. 450 pp.